

A framework for robust measurement of implied correlation

Daniël Linders, Wim Schoutens



A framework for robust measurement of implied correlation

Daniël Linders* Wim Schoutens†

Version: December 20, 2013

Abstract

In this paper we consider the problem of deriving correlation estimates from observed option data. An implied correlation estimate arises when we match the observed index option price with a corresponding model price. The underlying model assumes that stock prices can be described using a lognormal distribution, while a Gaussian copula describes the dependence structure. Within this multivariate stock price model, the index option price is not given in closed form and has to be approximated. Different methods exist and each choice leads to another implied correlation estimate.

We show that the traditional approach for determining implied correlations is a member of our more general framework. It turns out that the traditional implied correlation underestimates the real correlation. This error is more pronounced when some stock volatilities are large compared to the other volatility levels. We propose a new approach to measure implied correlation which does not have this drawback. However, our numerical illustrations show that determining implied correlations with the traditional approach may be justified for strike prices which are close to the at-the-money strike price.

We also show that implied correlation estimates can be used to define an index, called the Implied Correlation Index (ICX), which reflects the market's perception about future (short term) co-movement between stock prices. Using a volatility index together with the ICX gives an accurate description of the future level of market fear.

Keywords: implied correlation estimate, index option, vanilla option, implied volatility, VIX.

1 Introduction

The increased activity in multi-asset derivatives has resulted in an increased exposure to correlation risk for financial institutions. As a consequence, the correlation between

*KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium. Email: Daniel.Linders@econ.kuleuven.be

†KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium. Email: wim@schoutens.be

different assets is an important input variable for determining portfolio risk measures like the VaR. In Skintzi et al. (2005) and Wong (2012), the authors investigate the impact of a misspecification of the correlation on various risk measures. It is shown that even small errors in the correlation estimates can lead to serious errors in the value of the VaR.

Asset correlations are varying over time and a sudden change in the correlation levels may have an important impact on the risk profile of the asset portfolio; see e.g. Moskowitz (2003) or James et al. (2012). Therefore, it is important to track these correlation levels over time, because it gives information about the level of diversification one can obtain by composing an asset portfolio. In this paper we build a framework for determining today's level of diversification possible in a basket of stocks. It is well-documented that in a market in distress, correlations are relatively high, indicating that the diversification benefit one can obtain by composing a portfolio, is evaporating. In the extreme case there is no diversification possible and 'stock picking' doesn't make sense anymore; the portfolio return is not determined by the particular stocks composing the portfolio, but whether one is exposed to the stock market or not. The stock prices are moving in unison and the market behaves as one big asset.

Having an idea of today's diversification level is a challenging task. An estimate based on historical time series will result in a backwards looking measure and can never contain information about an event which is not captured in the data set. Stock and index options are publicly traded instruments and these derivative prices contain information about the market's view about the future movements of the financial market. Backing out correlation estimates from these traded derivatives results in a *forward looking* estimate of the future level of diversification, to which we refer as the *implied correlation*. A similar approach was followed in Skintzi and Refenes (2005) and Cont and Deguest (2012).

The traditional approach for determining implied correlations between stocks composing an index is based on a lognormal approximation for the distribution of the index. This methodology is widely adopted because it results in an easy and analytical expression for the implied correlation which is a combination of implied stock and index volatilities, provided we change the weights of the index in an appropriate way. Knowledge about the implied level of correlation is specially needed in volatile times. The lognormal approximation tends to fail in these situations, which makes it a *bad estimate in times when it is needed the most*. Indeed, we show that the traditional approach results in a systematic underestimation of the true correlation parameter. The error becomes more pronounced when some of the stock volatilities are becoming large. As a result, one has to be careful with the use of the traditional implied correlation.

We construct a framework for deriving implied correlation estimates. The implied correlation is determined by matching the observed index option price with a corresponding model price. This model assumes that the stock price dynamics can be described by a multivariate Black & Scholes model. Although this model suffers from some major drawbacks, it pays to consider this stock price model, because it is the most straightforward multivariate extension of the one dimensional Black & Scholes model; different Brownian motions are connected by a Gaussian copula resulting in a parsimonious multivariate stock price model where each stock is described by one volatility parameter and the dependence is fully captured by the pairwise correlations. The multivariate Black & Scholes

index option pricing formula can be considered as a benchmark pricing formula, similar to the one-dimensional Black & Scholes formula. In reality, implied stock volatilities will not be constant, which reflects the fact that a single volatility parameter is not sufficient to fully capture the stock dynamics. We account for this departure from the Black & Scholes setting by using the whole volatility surface. We also show that our new implied correlation can be used to construct an *Implied Correlation Index (ICX)* which is a more accurate co-movement measure than the current market standard for determining implied correlations, which is described in Chicago Board Options Exchange (2009).

We show that the traditional approach for determining implied correlation estimates is a particular member of our general framework. However, within this framework, more accurate correlation measures can be investigated. For example, we consider a correlation estimate based on convex upper and lower bounds. These convex bounds have proven their efficiency in various actuarial and financial problems; see e.g. Kaas et al. (2000), Dhaene et al. (2002b), among others. This new correlation index is more accurate and reliable than the traditional approach. In a regime where some volatilities are large, the new implied correlation still gives an accurate picture of the mean level of co-movement between the different stocks. Using implied correlation estimates for the period January 2000 - October 2009, we find that the traditional approach always underestimates the real correlation levels, but the error remains small and is on average 1.5%. We conclude that the traditional approach is justified when determining at-the-money implied correlation levels. However, when deep out-of-the-money options are used, the traditional approach sometimes underestimates the level of correlation by 6%.

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the financial market and the multivariate Black & Scholes model. In Section 3 the implied correlation smile and the Implied Correlation Index are introduced. After describing the most important numerical issues in Section 4, an illustration of the obtained results is given in Section 5. We show how the Implied Correlation Index behaves during the period January 2000 and October 2009. Market participants often use volatility indices as indicators for market fear. We argue that combining an estimate for the degree of co-movement with an estimate for the level of volatility, results in a more accurate description of the concept market fear. Section 6 concludes the paper.

2 The financial market

We assume a financial market¹ where n different (dividend or non-dividend paying) stocks, labeled from 1 to n , are traded. The financial market is arbitrage-free and there exists a pricing measure \mathbb{Q} , equivalent to the physical probability measure \mathbb{P} , such that the current price of any pay-off at time T can be represented as the expectation of the discounted pay-off. Assume that the risk-neutral stock prices $X_i(t)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, can be described

¹We use the common approach to describe the financial market via a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}, \mathbb{P})$.

by the following set of SDE's:

$$\frac{dX_i(t)}{X_i(t)} = (r - q_i) dt + \sigma_i dB_i(t), \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \quad (1)$$

where $\underline{B}(t) = (B_1(t), B_2(t), \dots, B_n(t))$, q_i is the continuously compounded dividend yield and r is the risk-free rate. Both r and q_i are assumed to be deterministic and constant over time. The process $\{\underline{B}(t) \mid t \geq 0\}$ is a standard n -dimensional Brownian motion. The correlation $\rho_{i,j}$ between the Brownian motions B_i and B_j is defined as

$$\rho_{i,j} = \text{Corr}[\sigma_i B_i(t), \sigma_j B_j(t+s)]. \quad (2)$$

The multivariate stock price model described above is called the *multivariate Black & Scholes model*. Under the risk-neutral pricing measure \mathbb{Q} , the time- T stock prices are lognormal distributed:

$$\ln \frac{X_i(T)}{X_i(0)} \stackrel{\mathbb{Q}}{=} N\left(\left(r - q_i - \frac{1}{2}\sigma_i^2\right)T, \sigma_i^2 T\right), \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \quad (3)$$

where ' $\stackrel{\mathbb{Q}}{=}$ ' denotes an 'equality in distribution under the \mathbb{Q} -measure'. For a detailed discussion about conditions for completeness and no-arbitrage in the multivariate Black & Scholes model, we refer to Dhaene, Kukush and Linders (2013), Björk (1998) and the references therein.

The time-0 prices of a vanilla call and put option on $X_i(T)$ with strike K and maturity T is denoted by $C_i[K, T]$ and $P_i[K, T]$, respectively. The price for an out-of-the-money vanilla option with strike price K and maturity T is denoted by $Q_i[K, T]$, where

$$Q_i[K, T] = \begin{cases} P_i[K, T], & \text{if } K < X_i(0), \\ \frac{C_i[K, T] + P_i[K, T]}{2}, & \text{if } K = X_i(0), \\ C_i[K, T], & \text{if } K > X_i(0). \end{cases}$$

If the risk-neutral dynamics of the stock price $X_i(T)$ can be described by the lognormal distribution (3), the option prices $C_i[K, T]$ and $P_i[K, T]$ can be determined using the well-known Black & Scholes option pricing formulae; see e.g. Black and Scholes (1973).

2.1 Index options and the multivariate Black & Scholes model

The market index is composed of a linear combination of the n underlying stocks. Denoting the price of the index at time t by $S(t)$, $0 \leq t \leq T$, we have that

$$S(t) = w_1 X_1(t) + w_2 X_2(t) + \dots + w_n X_n(t), \quad (4)$$

where w_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, are positive weights that are fixed up front. If the multivariate stock price dynamics can be described by (1), vanilla options can be priced using the Black & Scholes option pricing formula. Index options written on S , however, cannot be determined in closed form and the cdf F_S of S is not given in an analytical attractive

form. The most straightforward approach is to use Monte Carlo simulation to derive estimates for the index option prices. However, our search is for implied correlation estimates, hence an inversion of the index option pricing formula is required. Moreover, we want to construct a fast algorithm for determining implied correlations, which stresses the importance of a closed form (approximate) index option pricing formula which can be evaluated in an accurate and fast way.

An extensive bibliography is dedicated to the problem of finding accurate approximations for the index option prices $C[K, T]$ and $P[K, T]$; see e.g. Brooks et al. (1994), Milevsky and Posner (1998), Brigo et al. (2004), Deelstra et al. (2004), Carmona and Durrleman (2006) and Korn and Zeytun (2013). An analysis of the pricing of index options in the multivariate Black & Scholes model can be found in Krekel et al. (2007). Throughout the paper, we use the notations $\bar{C}[K, T]$ and $\bar{P}[K, T]$ for the approximate values of the index option prices $C[K, T]$ and $P[K, T]$, respectively. Any approach can be used to determine $\bar{C}[K, T]$ and $\bar{P}[K, T]$, provided they can be determined using the risk-free rate r , the dividend yields q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n and the Variance-Covariance matrix Σ . Of course, the approximation should be accurate:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{C}[K, T] &\approx C[K, T], \text{ for all } K \geq 0, \\ \bar{P}[K, T] &\approx P[K, T], \text{ for all } K \geq 0.\end{aligned}$$

Note that we use the notations $Q[K, T]$ and $\bar{Q}[K, T]$ to denote an out-of-the-money index option price and its approximation, respectively.

For our numerical illustrations, which are presented in Section 5, we use the approach proposed in Linders (2013) to derive $\bar{C}[K, T]$ and $\bar{P}[K, T]$. More precisely, approximate index option prices are derived by combining a convex upper and lower bound using a moment matching method. Furthermore, the approximate index curves \bar{C} and \bar{P} can be considered as index option curves written on a synthetic market index \bar{S} , which serves as an approximate index for the real index S . The cdf $F_{\bar{S}}$ of \bar{S} is given in closed form. Convex approximations for sums of dependent lognormal r.v.'s proved to be successful in earlier literature; see e.g. Dhaene et al. (2002b), Vanduffel et al. (2005), Dhaene et al. (2005), Van Weert et al. (2011) and Van Weert et al. (2010). They are all based on the theory of comonotonicity; see e.g. Dhaene et al. (2002a) and Deelstra et al. (2011).

In order to avoid unnecessary overloading of the notations, hereafter we will omit the fixed time index T when no confusion is possible.

2.2 Implied stock volatilities

Given the volatility parameter σ_i , the model price $Q_i[K]$ of an (out-of-the-money) vanilla option is given in closed form by the Black & Scholes formula. To emphasize the dependence on the volatility parameter, we sometimes write $Q_i[K; \sigma_i]$. Options on the individual stocks are traded on an options exchange and their prices can be observed. Information about the marginal volatilities $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n$ is contained in these traded prices. The distance between the observed out-of-the-money option price, denoted by $\hat{Q}_i[K]$, and

the theoretical Black & Scholes price $Q_i[K; \sigma_i]$ depends solely on σ_i . An implied estimate for the volatility parameter σ_i arises when we match the model price and the market price.

Definition 1 (Implied volatility) *The implied volatility of stock i with moneyness $\frac{K}{X_i(0)}$, denoted by $\hat{\sigma}_i\left[\frac{K}{X_i(0)}\right]$, is defined by the following equation:*

$$Q_i\left[K; \hat{\sigma}_i\left[\frac{K}{X_i(0)}\right]\right] = \hat{Q}_i[K]. \quad (5)$$

In a multivariate Black & Scholes model, the implied volatility should be constant, i.e. $\hat{\sigma}_i\left[\frac{K}{X_i(0)}\right] \approx \sigma_i$, for every K . However, one typically observes that implied volatilities depend on strike and maturity. The presence of the volatility surface implies that at least one of the assumptions in the model is wrong. For example, market practitioners are well-aware of the fact that modeling the dynamics of a stock by a lognormal distribution is flawed. The implied volatility can be interpreted as a number which contains information about the factors affecting the value of the option which are not included in the Black & Scholes model.

The *at-the-money Black & Scholes implied volatility* is the implied volatility $\hat{\sigma}_i[\pi]$ where the moneyness π is equal to 1. If no confusion is possible, we will denote this at-the-money implied volatility by $\hat{\sigma}_i$. The calculation of $\hat{\sigma}_i$ requires the market price $\hat{Q}_i[X_i(0)]$. In Section 4, we describe how to determine $\hat{\sigma}_i$ if $\hat{Q}_i[X_i(0)]$ is unknown. For a detailed overview of implied volatility we refer to Rubinstein (1994), Chriss (1996) and Gatheral (2006).

3 A framework for measuring implied Black & Scholes correlation

For a given strike K and maturity T , the (model) price $Q[K]$ of an index option depends on marginal information and information about the dependence structure. In the multivariate Black & Scholes model (1), the volatilities $\sigma_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ unambiguously specify the marginal risk-neutral distributions, whereas the dependence structure is modelled by the pairwise correlations $\rho_{i,j}, i, j = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Volatilities and correlations are not observable, but the prices of index and vanilla options are. As a result, the pricing of these derivatives is not a real issue. If we take the observed prices for granted, implied estimates for the volatilities and the correlations can be obtained by matching the theoretical model prices with the market prices. In Section 2.2 we described how to extract implied volatilities from vanilla option curves, in this section we show how index options can be used to determine implied estimates for the level of correlation between the stocks. Similar multivariate dependence measures can be found in Schmid and Schmidt (2007), Skintzi and Refenes (2005) and Dhaene, Linders, Schoutens and Vyncke (2013).

3.1 Implied correlation

Assume that the dynamics of the stocks are described by the multivariate Black & Scholes model. Information about the marginal volatilities $\underline{\sigma} = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n)$ is not sufficient to determine the approximation $\overline{Q}[K]$ for $Q[K]$. Indeed, $n(n-1)$ pairwise correlations $\rho_{i,j}$ have to be specified. Assume that all the correlations are equal to ρ :

$$\textbf{Assumption: } \rho_{i,j} = \rho, \text{ for } \begin{matrix} i \neq j \\ i = 1, 2, \dots, n \end{matrix} . \quad (6)$$

The parameter ρ can be interpreted as the average correlation level. In general, we have that $\rho \in \left[-\frac{1}{n-1}, 1\right]$.

If Condition (6) holds, we have that the marginal volatilities $\underline{\sigma}$ together with the correlation ρ completely specify the approximation $\overline{Q}[K]$ for $Q[K]$. To emphasize the dependence on $\underline{\sigma}$ and ρ , we sometimes write $\overline{Q}[K; \underline{\sigma}, \rho]$. If we replace the unknown marginal volatilities $\underline{\sigma} = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n)$ required to determine $\overline{Q}[K; \underline{\sigma}, \rho]$ by the implied volatilities $\widehat{\sigma}[\pi] = (\widehat{\sigma}_1[\pi], \widehat{\sigma}_2[\pi], \dots, \widehat{\sigma}_n[\pi])$ with equal moneyness $\pi = \frac{K}{S(0)}$, the implied correlation arises as the value for ρ such that the observed (out-of-the-money) index option price $\widehat{Q}[K]$ equals the model price $\overline{Q}[K]$.

Definition 2 (Implied correlation) *The Implied correlation of the index S with moneyness $\pi = \frac{K}{S(0)}$, denoted by $\widehat{\rho}[\pi]$, is defined by the following equation:*

$$\overline{Q}[K; \widehat{\sigma}[\pi], \widehat{\rho}[\pi]] = \widehat{Q}[K], \quad (7)$$

where $\widehat{\sigma}[\pi] = (\widehat{\sigma}_1[\pi], \widehat{\sigma}_2[\pi], \dots, \widehat{\sigma}_n[\pi])$ are the marginal implied volatilities with moneyness π , defined in Definition 1.

The implied correlation $\widehat{\rho}[\pi]$ can be determined if the model price $Q[S(0)\pi]$ can be approximated. The problem of determining the model prices $Q[S(0)\pi]$ was discussed in section 2.1. We conclude that different choices exist for the approximation $\overline{Q}[S(0)\pi]$ and each choice will result in a different estimate for $\widehat{\rho}[\pi]$. The closer $\overline{Q}[S(0)\pi]$ is to $Q[S(0)\pi]$, the more accurate the corresponding correlation estimate $\widehat{\rho}[\pi]$ will be. Note also that the implied correlation is given in an implicit form. In Section 3.2 we show that for a particular choice of the approximation $\overline{Q}[S(0)\pi]$, the implied correlation is given in closed form.

In a multivariate Black & Scholes model, the marginals are assumed to follow a log-normal distribution and these marginals are connected by a Gaussian copula. In case condition (6) holds, both the implied stock volatility surface and the implied correlation surface should be flat. If (6) does not hold, the implied correlation can be interpreted as a mean level of correlation.

The presence of the volatility smile for stock options indicates that the marginals are not lognormal, i.e. vanilla options are not priced by the Black & Scholes formula. In Definition 2, this departure from the Black & Scholes formula for vanilla options is taken

into account by using the implied stock volatilities when deriving the (approximate) index option value $\bar{Q}[K]$. Numerical illustrations show that the correlation estimates $\hat{\rho}[\pi]$ will change in function of π . The corresponding curve is referred to as the *correlation smile*. This smile indicates that, even if we account for the marginal volatility smiles, our model is not able to match the market prices with a single correlation parameter.

The *at-the-money Black & Scholes implied correlation* is the implied correlation $\hat{\rho}[\pi]$ where we take $\pi = 1$. If no confusion is possible, the at-the-money implied correlation is denoted by $\hat{\rho}$. In order to determine $\hat{\rho}$, an index option with strike $S(0)$ is required. In Section 4, we give a detailed description about the calculation of $\hat{\rho}$ when an index option with strike $S(0)$ is not traded. The implied correlation $\hat{\rho}$ is closely related to the implied correlation index, defined by the CBOE; see e.g. Chicago Board Options Exchange (2009). In Section 3.2, we will show that the latter approach will outperform the former approach when some of the volatilities become large.

3.2 Traditional implied correlation

The implied correlation $\hat{\rho}[\pi]$ defined in Definition 2 is an approximation for the correlation parameter which matches the observed index option price with the corresponding model price. This correlation estimate is reliable provided the real index S can be replaced by an appropriate approximate index \bar{S} and the corresponding approximate index option price $\bar{Q}[K]$ is given in closed form and close to the model price $Q[K]$. The implied correlation is, in general, only given by the implicit relation (7) and cannot be determined in an analytical way. In this subsection we consider a particular choice for the approximate index, which we will denote by \tilde{S} . We show that if \tilde{S} has a lognormal distribution, the implied correlation is given in closed form, provided we change the weights in an appropriate way.

The index S defined in (4) is a weighted average of lognormal r.v.'s. Having knowledge about the volatilities $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n$ together with the pairwise correlations $\rho_{i,j}$ does not enable us to determine the cdf F_S and the index option price $Q[K]$ in closed form. However, we can determine the variance $\text{Var}[S]$ of the index S :

$$\text{Var}[S] = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n w_i w_j X_i(0) X_j(0) e^{2rT} (e^{\rho_{i,j} \sigma_i \sigma_j T} - 1). \quad (8)$$

Assume for the moment that the (unknown) risk-neutral dynamics of the index S can be approximated by the index \tilde{S} , where

$$\frac{d\tilde{S}(t)}{\tilde{S}(t)} = rdt + \sigma_{\tilde{S}} d\tilde{B}(t). \quad (9)$$

Here, $\{\tilde{B}(t) \mid t \geq 0\}$ is a standard Brownian motion and $\tilde{S}(0) = S(0)$. In this model, the index \tilde{S} follows a lognormal distribution and its variance $\text{Var}[\tilde{S}]$ is given by

$$\text{Var}[\tilde{S}] = S(0)^2 e^{2rT} (e^{\sigma_{\tilde{S}}^2 T} - 1). \quad (10)$$

Index options written on \tilde{S} can be valued using the Black & Scholes option pricing formula. The price of an out-of-the-money index option on \tilde{S} with maturity T and strike K is denoted by $Q^{BLS}[K; \sigma_{\tilde{S}}]$. For a given moneyness π , the implied volatility $\hat{\sigma}_S[\pi]$ of S is determined such that the theoretical Black & Scholes option price $Q^{BLS}[K; \hat{\sigma}_S[\pi]]$ matches the market price $\hat{Q}[K]$. The at-the-money implied index volatility $\hat{\sigma}_S[1]$ is denoted by $\hat{\sigma}_S$. Note that in this case, matching the model price with the market price results in a volatility, and not a correlation parameter. However, an implied correlation estimate arises when we link the implied stock volatilities $\hat{\sigma}_1[\pi], \hat{\sigma}_2[\pi], \dots, \hat{\sigma}_n[\pi]$ with implied index volatility $\hat{\sigma}_S[\pi]$.

We consider the multivariate Black & Scholes model (1) where (6) holds. For a given moneyness π , knowledge about the marginal implied volatilities $\hat{\sigma}_1[\pi], \hat{\sigma}_2[\pi], \dots, \hat{\sigma}_n[\pi]$ is not sufficient to determine $\text{Var}[S]$ using expression (8). However, if we take $\sigma_{\tilde{S}} = \hat{\sigma}_S[\pi]$, $\text{Var}[\tilde{S}]$ follows from expression (10) and an implied correlation estimate, denoted by $\hat{\theta}[\pi]$, is defined such that

$$\text{Var}[S] = \text{Var}[\tilde{S}]. \quad (11)$$

This equation can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} S(0)^2 \left(e^{\hat{\sigma}_S^2[\pi]T} - 1 \right) &= \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2 X_i(0)^2 \left(e^{\hat{\sigma}_i^2[\pi]T} - 1 \right) \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n w_i w_j X_i(0) X_j(0) \left(e^{\hat{\theta}[\pi] \hat{\sigma}_i[\pi] \hat{\sigma}_j[\pi] T} - 1 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Approximating the exponential terms by a Taylor series results in

$$\hat{\sigma}_S^2[\pi] \approx \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{w}_i^2 \hat{\sigma}_i^2[\pi] + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n \tilde{w}_i \tilde{w}_j \hat{\theta}[\pi] \hat{\sigma}_i[\pi] \hat{\sigma}_j[\pi], \quad (13)$$

where

$$\tilde{w}_i = \frac{w_i X_i(0)}{S(0)}.$$

We find the following analytical expression for the implied correlation:

$$\hat{\theta}[\pi] \approx \frac{\hat{\sigma}_S^2[\pi] - \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{w}_i^2 \hat{\sigma}_i^2[\pi]}{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n \tilde{w}_i \tilde{w}_j \hat{\sigma}_i[\pi] \hat{\sigma}_j[\pi]}. \quad (14)$$

The correlation index $\hat{\theta}[\pi]$ can be interpreted as the average level of correlation between the stocks, based on out-of-the-money option prices with moneyness π . The at-the-money implied correlation $\hat{\theta}[1]$ is denoted by $\hat{\theta}$. The correlation estimate $\hat{\theta}$ is extensively investigated in Skintzi and Refenes (2005) for the Dow Jones Industrial Average. In Chicago Board Options Exchange (2009), an implied correlation index for the S&P500 is defined which is closely related to $\hat{\theta}$.

Remark that for given implied index and stock volatilities, the use of formula (14) does not guarantee that the corresponding correlation estimate $\hat{\theta}[\pi]$ is smaller than one. We discuss this issue in more detail in Section 4.

3.2.1 Fallacies of the traditional implied correlation

The at-the-money correlation coefficient $\hat{\theta}$ defined in (12) depends on a lognormal approximation for a weighted sum of dependent lognormal r.v.'s. It is well-known that the sum S is not lognormal distributed; see e.g. Vanduffel et al. (2005) and Huang et al. (2004), but one might hope that the approximation is reasonable and that the implied correlation $\hat{\theta}[\pi]$ is a good approximation. In this example we illustrate that there exist situations where the lognormal approximation fails to provide an accurate description for the sum S , which results in a serious underestimation of the implied correlation; see also Embrechts et al. (1999).

Consider a market with two stocks. The risk-neutral dynamics can be described by the following SDE's:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dX_1(t)}{X_1(t)} = rdt + \sigma_1 dB_1(t), \\ \frac{dX_2(t)}{X_2(t)} = rdt + \sigma_2 dB_2(t). \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

For the initial stock prices we take $X_1(0) = X_2(0) = 100$. We assume that $r = 3\%$ and $\sigma_1 = 20\%$. The correlation coefficient ρ is equal to 80%. The maturity T is set to 1 year. The stock market index S is

$$S(t) = 0.5X_1(t) + 0.5X_2(t). \quad (16)$$

The only unknown parameter of the vector $(X_1(t), X_2(t))$ is the volatility σ_2 , which we will fix later. Having values for all the parameters, the variance $\text{Var}[S]$ of S can be determined using expression (8) and is a function of σ_2 .

Assume now that the risk-neutral dynamics of the index S can be approximated by the r.v. \tilde{S} , which can be described by (9). If σ_2 is fixed, we know the exact value for $\text{Var}[S]$ and we can choose the volatility parameter $\sigma_{\tilde{S}}$ such that $\text{Var}[S] = \text{Var}[\tilde{S}]$. We approximate the distribution of S using the lognormal r.v. \tilde{S} such that the first two moments of this lognormal approximation match the exact first two moments; see e.g. Brigo et al. (2004).

Given $\sigma_2 > 0$, the price of an index call option with strike $K = 100$ and maturity $T = 1$ year is denoted by $C[100]$. This price can be approximated using Monte Carlo simulation and we denote this simulated value by $C^{sim}[100]$. Using a lognormal approximation \tilde{S} for the index S , this option price can be determined using the Black & Scholes option pricing formula. The Black & Scholes price is denoted by $C^{BLS}[100]$. Finally, we also include an alternative approximation \bar{S} for S . Here, we use the approximation based on convex upper and lower bounds derived in Linders (2013). This approximate index option price is denoted by $\bar{C}[100]$. The three different approximations are presented in Figure 1 for various choices of σ_2 .

Figure 1 clearly illustrates the fallacies of the lognormal approximation. If the volatility σ_2 becomes large (compared to σ_1), the call option $C^{BLS}[100]$ diverges from the simulated option price $C^{sim}[100]$, whereas the approximate price $\bar{C}[100]$ is always an accurate approximation.

Assume for the moment that the marginal volatilities σ_1 and σ_2 are known and the price $C[100]$ of the index option can be observed, while the volatility $\sigma_{\tilde{S}}$ and the correlation ρ




Figure 1: Approximations for the price of an index call option with strike $K = 100$ and maturity $T = 1$ year.

are unknown and have to be estimated from the observed index option price. Figure 1 shows that the implied index volatility $\hat{\sigma}$ will be lower than the volatility parameter $\sigma_{\tilde{S}}$, for which (11) holds. As a result, the implied correlation $\hat{\theta}$ determined using equation (12) will also be too low. This effect is more pronounced when the volatility σ_2 is large. The accurate performance of the approximation $\bar{C}[100]$ will result in a better estimate $\hat{\rho}$ for the correlation. This example can be generalized to the situation where the index S consists of more than two stocks. When the volatilities of some stocks are large compared to the rest of the volatilities, a similar dysfunctioning of the implied correlation is observed.

The situation where some volatilities become large occurs in a market where there is a high degree of market stress. In this example, we showed that during these periods of increased market fear, the traditional implied correlation gives misleading information. We can state that *the traditional implied correlation is a bad indicator when it is needed the most*.

4 Numerical issues

Before we give a number of numerical illustrations of the implied correlation for the Dow Jones Industrial Average in Section 5, we first consider some practical considerations.

Bid-ask spread In practice, we will not observe a single index option price $\hat{Q}[K]$ for each traded strike K . Instead, we will observe a bid price and a larger ask price. In order

to cope with this bid/ask spread, we propose to use midquote prices as an approximation for the theoretical option prices. Similar conventions are made for vanilla option prices.

Implied volatilities In reality, only a finite number of vanilla options are traded. For stock i , the traded strikes below the current stock price $X_i(0)$ are denoted by $K_{i,-l_i} < K_{i,-l_i+1} < \dots < K_{i,0}$. The strike prices which exceed $X_i(0)$ are given by $K_{i,1} < K_{i,2} < \dots < K_{i,h_i}$. The vanilla option prices $\widehat{Q}_i[K_j]$ for $j = -l_i, -l_i+1, \dots, h_i$ can be observed in the market. We assume that $l_i > 0$ and $h_i > 1$.

The implied volatility $\widehat{\sigma}_i[\pi]$ of stock i is determined such that the corresponding Black & Scholes price with moneyness π matches the observed option price with the same moneyness. If the underlying options are of European type, $\widehat{\sigma}_i[\pi]$ follows from an inversion of the Black & Scholes formula. We determine the implied volatility $\widehat{\sigma}_i[\pi]$, defined in Definition 1, such that the distance between the theoretical price and the observed price becomes minimal. To be more precise, $\widehat{\sigma}_i[\pi]$ follows from:

$$\widehat{\sigma}_i[\pi] = \arg \min_{\sigma \geq 0} \frac{|Q_i[K; \sigma] - \widehat{Q}_i[K]|}{\widehat{Q}_i[K]}, \quad (17)$$

where $K = \pi X_i(0)$. Note that another choice for the objective function leads to a different implied volatility estimate; see e.g. Guillaume and Schoutens (2012). In general, K will not be a traded strike, so $\widehat{Q}_i[K]$ cannot be observed. Assume for the moment that K lies in between the traded strikes $K_{i,j}$ and $K_{i,j+1}$, so $K_{i,j} < K < K_{i,j+1}$, where $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $j \in [-l_i, h_i]$. The option prices $\widehat{Q}_i[K_{i,j}]$ and $\widehat{Q}_i[K_{i,j+1}]$ can be observed in the market, so $\widehat{\sigma}_i[\pi_{i,j}]$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_i[\pi_{i,j+1}]$ can be determined via (17), where we have put $\pi_{i,j} = \frac{K_{i,j}}{X_i(0)}$ and $\pi_{i,j+1} = \frac{K_{i,j+1}}{X_i(0)}$. The implied volatility with moneyness π is determined as an interpolation between $\widehat{\sigma}_i[\pi_{i,j}]$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_i[\pi_{i,j+1}]$:

$$\widehat{\sigma}_i[\pi] = \widehat{\sigma}_i[\pi_{i,j}] \frac{K_{i,j+1} - K}{K_{i,j+1} - K_{i,j}} + \widehat{\sigma}_i[\pi_{i,j+1}] \frac{K - K_{i,j}}{K_{i,j+1} - K_{i,j}}. \quad (18)$$

If $K < K_{i,-l_i}$, we put $\pi_{i,j} = \frac{K_{i,-l_i}}{X_i(0)}$ and $\pi_{i,j+1} = \frac{K_{i,-l_i+1}}{X_i(0)}$, whereas for $K > K_{i,h_i}$, we choose $\pi_{i,j} = \frac{K_{i,h_i-1}}{X_i(0)}$ and $\pi_{i,j+1} = \frac{K_{i,h_i}}{X_i(0)}$. In this situation, $\widehat{\sigma}_i[\pi]$ follows from an extrapolation between $\widehat{\sigma}_i[\pi_{i,j}]$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_i[\pi_{i,j+1}]$.

The options written on the stocks composing the Dow Jones index are of American type. The industry standard for pricing American type options is the Cox-Ross-Rubinstein binomial tree model; see Cox et al. (1979). This discrete stock price model requires, besides the risk-free rate, the strike price and the time to maturity, only the volatility as input variable. The implied volatility $\widehat{\sigma}_i[\pi]$ follows from equation (17), where $Q_i[K; \sigma]$ has to be understood as the Cox-Ross-Rubinstein option price with volatility parameter σ .

The implied volatility on the index with moneyness π is denoted by $\widehat{\sigma}[\pi]$. The *at-the-money index volatility* $\widehat{\sigma}[1]$ is closely related to the Black & Scholes implied volatility

index (Ticker VXO); see e.g. Carr and Wu (2006) and Whaley (2000). In the sequel of the paper, we define $\text{VXO}[T]$ as follows:

$$\text{VXO}[T] = \hat{\sigma}[1].$$

Until here, we always assumed that vanilla and index options with maturity T are traded. In practice, the closest traded maturities are T_1 and T_2 , satisfying $T_1 < T < T_2$. Options with maturity T_1 are called near term options, while next term options have a maturity equal to T_2 . If the near term maturity T_1 is less than 7 days, we define T_1 to be the first maturity exceeding T while T_2 is the first maturity exceeding T_1 . Using near term and next term options, $\text{VXO}[T_1]$ and $\text{VXO}[T_2]$ can be determined using (18). We then define $\text{VXO}[T]$ as follows:

$$\text{VXO}[T] = \sqrt{\frac{1}{T} \left(T_1 \text{VXO}^2[T_1] \frac{T_2 - T}{T_2 - T_1} + T_2 \text{VXO}^2[T_2] \frac{T - T_1}{T_2 - T_1} \right)}. \quad (19)$$

The at-the-money Black & Scholes volatility index $\text{VXO}[T]$ represents the perception of the market about future volatility; see e.g. Whaley (2000). VXO can be considered as the model-based counterpart of the volatility index VIX, which is discussed in Carr and Wu (2006) and Chicago Board Options Exchange (2003).

Implied correlation The current price level of the index is $S(0)$. Index options are traded for a finite number of strike prices. The market prices of these index options are denoted by $\hat{C}[K]$ and $\hat{P}[K]$. The traded strike prices below $S(0)$ are $K_{-l} < K_{-l+1} < \dots < K_{-1} < K_0$ whereas $K_1 < K_2 < \dots < K_h$ are the strike prices which exceed $S(0)$. We assume that $l > 0$ and $h > 1$.

For a given moneyness π , the implied correlation $\hat{\rho}[\pi]$ is determined such that the approximate index option price coincides with the corresponding observed index option price. In this paper, the approximate index option price is determined by combining convex upper and lower bounds for the index S ; see Linders (2013), but other approximations may be used, as was discussed in Section 2.1. In general, it is not possible to find an explicit formula for $\hat{\rho}[\pi]$ such that (7) holds. Via (18), we can determine the vector $\hat{\underline{\sigma}}[\pi]$ containing the marginal implied volatilities with moneyness π . We then search for $\hat{\rho}[\pi]$ such that the distance between the theoretical index option price and the market price is minimized:

$$\hat{\rho}[\pi] = \arg \min_{\rho \in (0,1)} \frac{\left| \overline{Q}[K; \hat{\underline{\sigma}}[\pi], \rho] - \hat{Q}[K] \right|}{\hat{Q}[K]}, \quad (20)$$

where $K = \pi S(0)$.

In case we take $\rho > 1$, it is still possible to determine $\overline{Q}[K; \hat{\underline{\sigma}}[\pi], \rho]$, in the sense that it will not lead to a breakdown of the calculations. So we can search for a minimum in the set of all non-negative values ρ and allow correlations bigger than one. We have witnessed that an implied correlation strictly bigger than one typically occurs when the moneyness is low. Of course, $\rho > 1$ doesn't make any sense. Therefore, we only consider

implied correlation estimates where the moneyness is sufficiently large (e.g. $\pi > 0.75$) and we do not recommend the proposed methodology below this threshold. The observation that implied correlations bigger than one can occur, may be interpreted as the price we have to pay for working in the simple multivariate stock price model (1). In order to cope with this problem, one has to model the marginals with a more realistic distribution than the lognormal distribution. However, determining $\bar{Q}[K; \hat{\sigma}[\pi], \rho]$ in this new multivariate model is in general a hard problem and, to the best of our knowledge, this problem is not solved yet. Related results can be found in e.g. Moosbrucker (2006), Albrecher et al. (2007) and Garcia et al. (2009), where implied correlation estimates are determined from CDO prices and in Tavin (2013) for implied correlation estimates based on spread options.

If the strike K is not a traded strike price, $\hat{Q}[K]$ cannot be observed in the market. Assume for the moment that K lies in between the two traded strike prices K_j and K_{j+1} , so $K_j < K < K_{j+1}$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $j \in [-l, h]$. The index option prices $\hat{Q}[K_j]$ and $\hat{Q}[K_{j+1}]$ can be observed in the market and the implied correlations $\hat{\rho}[\pi_j]$ and $\hat{\rho}[\pi_{j+1}]$ can be determined using (20), where $\pi_j = K_j/S(0)$ and $\pi_{j+1} = K_{j+1}/S(0)$. The implied correlation with moneyness π follows from an interpolation between $\hat{\rho}[\pi_j]$ and $\hat{\rho}[\pi_{j+1}]$:

$$\hat{\rho}[\pi] = \hat{\rho}[\pi_j] \frac{K_{j+1} - K}{K_{j+1} - K_j} + \hat{\rho}[\pi_{j+1}] \frac{K - K_j}{K_{j+1} - K_j}. \quad (21)$$

The *at-the-money implied correlation index* $\hat{\rho}$ with maturity T is denoted by $\text{ICX}[T]$:

$$\text{ICX}[T] = \hat{\rho}[1].$$

Having vanilla and index options for the near term and next term maturities T_1 and T_2 , the implied at-the-money correlation indices $\text{ICX}[T_1]$ and $\text{ICX}[T_2]$ can be determined². The implied correlation index $\text{ICX}[T]$ can now be determined as follows:

$$\text{ICX}[T] = \frac{T_2 - T}{T_2 - T_1} \text{ICX}[T_1] + \frac{T - T_1}{T_2 - T_1} \text{ICX}[T_2]. \quad (22)$$

Similar to the implied volatility defined by (19), the implied at-the-money correlation index with maturity T is determined as an inter- or extrapolation between the traded maturities T_1 and T_2 , where we ‘roll’ to the next maturities if T_1 is smaller than 7 days. The implied correlation index $\text{ICX}[T]$ can be considered as a measure for the perception of the market about the degree of co-movement in the period $[0, T]$.

Note that the main difference between our implied correlation index ICX and the CBOE implied correlation index is that we keep the time to maturity fixed at 30 days, whereas the CBOE implied correlation index fixes a maturity date (e.g. 1 year).

5 Numerical illustration

Dow Jones The Dow Jones Industrial Average, established 1896, is a price-weighted index composed of the 30 largest, most liquid NYSE and NASDAQ listed stocks. Options

²Note that we silently assume that the near term and next term maturity for stock i are given by T_1 and T_2 , respectively.

with the DJ index as underlying are called DJX options. DJX options are based on 1/100th of the current value of the DJ. Therefore, hereafter $S(t)$ has to be interpreted as 1/100th of the value of the DJ at time t .

Implied correlation smile For a given maturity T , the curve $\hat{\rho}[\pi]$ is called the implied correlation smile. We find that the implied correlation *decreases* in function of the moneyness: low strike prices require a higher correlation parameter than high strike prices. The implied correlation for low strike prices is determined using out-of-the-money index put options, whereas out-of-the-money index call options are used to determine the implied correlation for high strike prices. Out-of-the money index put options are a bet on a decline of the market, whereas an out-of-the-money call option will end in the money when the market rises. With this in mind, the decreasing implied correlation curve may imply that the market expects stocks to go down simultaneously, while they are expected to go up more independently.

The right panel of Figure 2 shows the correlation smile for the Dow Jones on March 2, 2009, where the time to maturity is equal to 47 days. For each traded strike K_j , $j = -l, -l + 1, \dots, h$, the implied correlation $\hat{\rho}[\pi_j]$ with moneyness $\pi_j = \frac{K_j}{S(0)}$ is shown in the graph. The left panel shows the index option prices $\hat{C}[K_j]$ and $\hat{P}[K_j]$ (circles) together with the model prices $\bar{C}[K_j; \hat{\sigma}[\pi_j], \hat{\rho}[\pi_j]]$ and $\bar{P}[K_j; \hat{\sigma}[\pi_j], \hat{\rho}[\pi_j]]$ (crosses). We find that for the majority of the trading days, the implied correlation is a decreasing function of π .

Implied correlation over time We choose T to be 30 days. The implied correlation index $ICX[T]$ is a number which represents the level of diversification possible by investing in the stocks X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n . A high value for $ICX[T]$ indicates that market participants expect that stocks will move more strongly together in the near future. Indeed, the $ICX[T]$ is based on short term traded index and vanilla options, which contain the view of the market about the near future. We say that the ICX is a forward looking index for the degree of co-movement between the stock prices composing the index. Having daily (or even more frequent) quotes for the ICX is important for shareholders, investors and regulators, because one can anticipate highly correlated markets.

A graph of historical values of the ICX is shown in Figure 6. The third graph is a smoothed version of the second graph, where at each day we have taken the average over the last 7 consecutive days. The average implied correlation level over the whole period is 36%. Begin 2000, implied levels of correlation for the Dow Jones are around 20%. The degree of co-movement starts increasing during the burst of the Dot-Com bubble. On September 17, 2001 the ICX peaks around 51%. On August 2, 2002, the ICX attains a new maximum of 70% and the highest value of 82% was recorded on February 22, 2003. From 2007 on, correlations are again increasing, with a peak of 85% in October, 2008, after the Lehmann Brothers collapse. During 2009, the average level of correlation remains at a historical high level (51% on average).

During periods of strong co-movement, markets are in most of the situations going down. The peaks in Figure 6 can be related in time with major events like September

11, 2001, the default of Lehmann Brothers,... In these ‘headline driven’ markets, there is a high degree of uncertainty about the future and stocks tend to move more strongly together than during periods where there are no major news items dominating the trading floor.

The ICX is a model-based index for the degree of co-movement, or herd behavior. We already showed that a price has to be paid for working in the simple multivariate Black & Scholes model (1), in the sense that implied correlations may be bigger than one. Alternatively, one can choose to use a model-free index for the degree of herd behavior; see e.g. Dhaene, Linders, Schoutens and Vyncke (2012), Laurence (2008), Laurence and Wang (2008), Dhaene, Dony, Forays, Linders and Schoutens (2012) and Kim et al. (2014). However, in order to determine these co-movement measures a lot of data is needed. Indeed, one needs a vanilla option curve for each stock and an index option curve in order to determine a model-free co-movement estimate. An implied correlation estimate, on the other hand, only requires one vanilla option per stock and a single index option.

Traditional implied correlation index The only quoted index which reflects the degree of co-movement between stock prices is the CBOE S&P 500 implied correlation index; see e.g. Chicago Board Options Exchange (2009). This index is the industry standard and is widely used to set up so called dispersion trades, which are strategies designed to trade co-movement. The methodology for calculating this implied correlation index can easily be adapted to other indices, as long as there are traded options on the index and the underlyings. The methodology for the CBOE implied correlation is based on expression (14). In Section 3 we introduced a framework for determining implied correlation estimates. A particular member of this framework is the traditional implied correlation $\hat{\theta}[\pi]$, which is given by the easy expression (14). By using a more sophisticated approximation for the index option prices, a more reliable and accurate implied correlation estimate $\hat{\rho}[\pi]$ can be determined; see Section 3.2.1.

Figure 4 shows the difference between the at-the-money implied correlation estimates $\hat{\rho}[1]$ and $\hat{\theta}[1]$, for a maturity $T = 30$ days. We see that this difference is always positive, which shows that the traditional implied correlation systematically underestimates the correlation levels. However, the average difference is 1.5%, which shows that for determining at-the-money implied correlation levels, the traditional approach may be justified.

In the following example we show that the difference $\hat{\rho}[\pi] - \hat{\theta}[\pi]$ can become large when the moneyness π is small. Figure 5 shows the estimates $\hat{\rho}[\pi]$ and $\hat{\theta}[\pi]$ for the DJ implied correlation on July 21, 2008 and October 20, 2008. In both cases, the time to maturity is 89 days. In section 3.2.1, we showed that the traditional approach underestimates the real level of correlation. Furthermore, this error increases when some volatilities are large compared to the other volatilities. The difference $\hat{\rho}[\pi] - \hat{\theta}[\pi]$ is depicted in the right panels of Figure 5. We find that the difference is positive and increases when the strike becomes smaller. During October 20, 2008, the error is bigger compared to July 21, 2008. The difference between the two trading days may be explained if we have a look at the at-the-money implied volatilities listed in Table 1. On October 20, 2008, we are in the middle of the financial crisis and some volatilities exceed 100%. July 21, 2008, on the contrary, is much calmer and volatility levels are in a more normal range.

Implied Volatility The implied at-the-money volatility of a broad index is often used as an estimate for the future volatility of the market. The third graph of Figure 7 shows the implied Dow Jones volatility $VXO[30 \text{ days}]$ for the period January 2000 - October 2009. The VXO and the ICX index move strongly together, indicating that periods of increased co-movement are going hand in hand with periods of increased volatility. It is well-documented that periods of high market stress are characterized by high levels of volatility and a strong co-movement between stock prices. Today, market participants often use indices for the future level of volatility as a fear gauge.

Figure 8 shows the implied correlation as a function of the implied volatility. The regime around January 2009 (circles) is characterized by high implied volatilities and high implied correlations. However, watching only volatility can be too narrow to estimate the sentiment of the market. For example, there is no big difference between the period January - December 2000 (plusses) and the period November 2007 - March 2008 (crosses) when we only look at the volatility levels. But the two periods do differ when we look at the corresponding implied correlation levels. Figure 8 also shows that during 2004 (squares), volatility levels were relatively stable, while the changes in implied correlation are more pronounced. Interesting to notice is that in the period January 2000 - October 2009, there are no situations where volatility is relatively big, but correlation is low. For example, there are no trading days where $VXO[T] > 0.3$ but $ICX[T] < 0.4$.

Combining an estimate of future volatility with an estimate for the future level of co-movement between stocks gives a broader view of the fear present in the market. Instead of looking only at volatility, the couple $(VXO[T], ICX[T])$ gives a more accurate picture of today's level of market fear and may be used to detect periods of increased market fear in an early stage; see also Dhaene, Dony, Forys, Linders and Schoutens (2012).




Figure 2: March 2, 2009, Dow Jones, time to maturity 47 days. Implied correlation smile (right) $\rho[\pi]$ for the traded strike prices. The left panel shows the market prices $\hat{C}[K]$ and $\hat{P}[K]$ (circles) of index call and put options and the corresponding approximations (dots) $\bar{C}\left[K, \hat{\rho}\left[\frac{K}{S(0)}\right]\right]$ and $\bar{P}\left[K, \hat{\rho}\left[\frac{K}{S(0)}\right]\right]$.




Figure 3: March 5, 2005, Dow Jones, time to maturity 44 days. Implied correlation smile (right) $\rho[\pi]$ for the traded strike prices. The left panel shows the market prices $\hat{C}[K]$ and $\hat{P}[K]$ (circles) of index call and put options and the corresponding approximations (dots) $\bar{C}\left[K, \hat{\rho}\left[\frac{K}{S(0)}\right]\right]$ and $\bar{P}\left[K, \hat{\rho}\left[\frac{K}{S(0)}\right]\right]$.




Figure 4: We test the accuracy of the traditional implied correlation estimate $\hat{\theta}[1]$, by showing the difference $\hat{\rho}[1] - \hat{\theta}[1]$ for the period January 2000 - October 2009.




Figure 5: The Dow Jones implied correlation $\hat{\rho}[\pi]$ and the traditional implied correlation $\hat{\theta}[\pi]$ for July 21, 2008 (upper left) and October 20, 2008 (lower left), with time to maturity equal to 89 days. The difference $\hat{\theta}[\pi] - \hat{\rho}[\pi]$ for these two trading days is shown on the right.




Figure 6: The Dow Jones price levels between January 2000 and October 2009 (first graph). The second plot shows the 30 days DJ-ICX. The third graph shows a smoothed version of the second plot.




Figure 7: The Dow Jones price levels between January 2000 and October 2009 (first graph). The second plot shows the 30 days DJ-ICX. The third graph shows the 30 days implied at-the-money index volatility.

Table 1: At-the-money implied volatilities

	July 21, 2008	October 20, 2008
Alcoa Incorporated	52.79%	96.30%
American Express Company	49.17%	111.59%
Bank of America	66.26%	91.05%
Boeing Corporation	37.10%	70.56%
Caterpillar	35.28%	75.69%
JP Morgan	48.97%	80.19%
Chevron	32.03%	66.50%
Citigroup	54.89%	101.28%
Coca Cola Company	26.64%	47.05%
Walt Disney Company	29.86%	56.31%
DuPont	28.08%	69.23%
Exxon Mobile	30.03%	68.44%
General Electric	31.30%	76.45%
General Motors	109.46%	215.81%
Hewlet-Packard	32.20%	49.07%
Home Depot	49.67%	68.50%
Intel	37.65%	73.30%
IBM	27.09%	64.86%
Johnson & Johnson	19.67%	46.32%
McDonald's	29.02%	48.29%
Merck & Company	36.41%	58.04%
Microsoft	32.10%	75.62%
3M	31.59%	47.20%
Pfizer	31.69%	53.32%
Practer & Gamble	21.71%	48.15%
AT&T	33.29%	66.65%
United Technologies	31.54%	54.79%
Verizon	28.51%	55.08%
Wal-Mart Stores	29.66%	62.23%
Kraft Foods		44.89%
American International group	67.52%	




Figure 8: Dow Jones implied correlation as a function of the implied volatility.

6 Conclusion

In this paper it is assumed that options on an index and the stocks composing this index are traded on an options exchange and their prices can be observed. Therefore, the pricing of these derivatives is not the real issue. Given the marginals are lognormal distributed, we can extract the marginal volatility parameters implied by the observed vanilla options. Typically, out-of-the-money put options require a higher volatility parameter than out-of-the-money call options. Provided the index option prices are given, we now use the volatility surface for each stock and extract the single correlation parameter such that the model price matches the market price. The traditional approach for determining implied correlation levels is a particular member of our framework. Furthermore, we can improve the traditional approach by considering more accurate approximations for the index option price. We show that this new implied correlation index outperforms the traditional approach. It turns out that the traditional implied correlation underestimates the real correlation. This error is more pronounced when some stock volatilities are large compared to the other volatility levels, which may occur in times of market stress. We conclude that in a situation of increased market fear, the traditional implied correlation is a dangerous measure, because it may give misleading signals. However, our numerical illustrations show that determining implied correlations with the traditional approach may be justified for strike prices which are close to the at-the-money strike price.

We have shown that implied correlation estimates can be used to define an index, called the Implied Correlation Index (ICX), which reflects the market's perception about future (short term) co-movement between stock prices. A value close to 1 indicates that the market expects stocks to move almost perfectly together, which implies that one cannot benefit from a diversification effect when composing a portfolio of stocks. It is well-known that high levels of co-movement are often associated with an increased market fear. Hence the diversification benefit one hopes for is evaporating when it is needed the most. Therefore, it is important to construct indicators which are able to signal periods of increased market fear. Nowadays, implied volatility levels serve as fear indicators. We have shown that using an estimate for the future (short term) volatility together with an estimate for the future level of co-movement gives a more accurate description of the future level of market fear.

Acknowledgement: *Daniël Linders acknowledges the financial support of the Onderzoeksfonds KU Leuven (GOA/12/002/TBA: Management of Financial and Actuarial Risks: Modeling, Regulation, Incentives and Market Effects) and the support of the AXA Research Fund (Measuring and managing herd behavior risk in stock markets). The authors also thank Jan Dhaene for fruitful discussions*

References

Albrecher, H., Ladoucette, S. and Schoutens, W. (2007), A generic one-factor Lévy model for pricing synthetic cdo's, *in* M. Fu, R. Jarrow, J.-Y. Yen and R. Elliott,

- eds, ‘Advances in Mathematical Finance’, Applied and Numerical Harmonic Analysis, Birkhäuser Boston, pp. 259–277.
- Björk, T. (1998), *Arbitrage theory in continuous time*, Oxford University Press. pp. 311.
- Black, F. and Scholes, M. (1973), ‘The pricing of options and corporate liabilities’, *The Journal of Political Economy* **81**(3), pp. 637–654.
- Brigo, D., Mercurio, F., Rapisarda, F. and Scotti, R. (2004), ‘Approximated moment-matching dynamics for basket-options pricing’, *Quantitative Finance* **4**(1), 1–16.
- Brooks, R., Corson, J. and Wales, J. D. (1994), ‘The pricing of index options when the underlying assets all follow a lognormal diffusion’, *Advances in Futures and Options Research* **7**.
- Carmona, R. and Durrleman, V. (2006), ‘Generalizing the black-scholes formula to multivariate contingent claims’, *Journal of Computational Finance* **9**, 43–67.
- Carr, P. and Wu, L. (2006), ‘A tale of two indices’, *The Journal of Derivatives* **13**(3), 13–29.
- Chicago Board Options Exchange (2003), The CBOE volatility index - VIX, *White Paper*.
- Chicago Board Options Exchange (2009), CBOE S&P 500 implied correlation index, *Working Paper*.
- Chriss, N. (1996), *Black Scholes and Beyond: Option Pricing Models*, McGraw-Hill Companies, Incorporated.
- Cont, R. and Deguest, R. (2012), ‘Equity correlations implied by index options: Estimation and model uncertainty analysis’, *Mathematical Finance*. Accepted for publication.
- Cox, J. C., Ross, S. A. and Rubinstein, M. (1979), ‘Option pricing: A simplified approach’, *Journal of Financial Economics* **7**(3), 229–263.
- Deelstra, G., Dhaene, J. and Vanmaele, M. (2011), An overview of comonotonicity and its applications in finance and insurance, in B. Oksendal and G. Nunno, eds, ‘Advanced Mathematical Methods for Finance’, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 155–179.
- Deelstra, G., Liinev, J. and Vanmaele, M. (2004), ‘Pricing of arithmetic basket options by conditioning’, *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **34**(1), 55 – 77.
- Dhaene, J., Denuit, M., Goovaerts, M., Kaas, R. and Vyncke, D. (2002a), ‘The concept of comonotonicity in actuarial science and finance: theory’, *Insurance: Mathematics & Economics* **31**(1), 3–33.
- Dhaene, J., Denuit, M., Goovaerts, M., Kaas, R. and Vyncke, D. (2002b), ‘The concept of comonotonicity in actuarial science and finance: applications’, *Insurance: Mathematics & Economics* **31**(2), 133–161.

- Dhaene, J., Dony, J., Forays, M. B., Linders, D. and Schoutens, W. (2012), Fix - the fear index: Measuring market fear, *in* ‘Topics in Numerical Methods for Finance, Cummins M. et al. (eds.). Springer Proceedings in Mathematics and Statistics’.
- Dhaene, J., Kukush, A. and Linders, D. (2013), ‘The multivariate black & scholes market: conditions for completeness and no-arbitrage’, *Theory of Probability and Mathematical Statistics* (88), 1–14.
- Dhaene, J., Linders, D., Schoutens, W. and Vyncke, D. (2012), ‘The herd behavior index: A new measure for the implied degree of co-movement in stock markets’, *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **50**(3), 357–370.
- Dhaene, J., Linders, D., Schoutens, W. and Vyncke, D. (2013), ‘A multivariate dependence measure for aggregating risks’, *Journal of computational and applied mathematics* . To be published.
- Dhaene, J., Vanduffel, S., Goovaerts, M. J., Kaas, R. and Vyncke, D. (2005), ‘Comonotonic approximations for optimal portfolio selection problems’, *Journal of Risk and Insurance* **72**, 253–301.
- Embrechts, P., McNeil, A. and Straumann, D. (1999), Correlation and dependence in risk management: properties and pitfalls, *in* ‘Risk Management: Value at Risk and Beyond’, Cambridge University Press, pp. 176–223.
- Garcia, J., Goossens, S., Masol, V. and Schoutens, W. (2009), ‘Levy base correlation’, *Wilmott Journal* **1**, 95–100.
- Gatheral, J. (2006), *The Volatility Surface: A Practitioner’s Guide*, Wiley Finance, Wiley.
- Guillaume, F. and Schoutens, W. (2012), ‘Calibration risk: Illustrating the impact of calibration risk under the heston model’, *Review of Derivatives Research* **15**(1), 57–79.
- Huang, H., Milevsky, M. and Wang, J. (2004), ‘Ruined moments in your life: How good are the approximations?’, *Insurance: Mathematics & Economics* **3**(34), 421–447.
- James, J., Kasikov, K. and Edwards, K.-A. (2012), ‘The end of diversification’, *Quantitative Finance* **12**(11), 1629–1636.
- Kaas, R., Dhaene, J. and Goovaerts, M. J. (2000), ‘Upper and lower bounds for sums of random variables’, *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **27**(2), 151 – 168.
- Kim, C., Choi, Y., Lee, W. and Ahn, J. Y. (2014), Analyzing herd behavior in global stock markets: an interncontinental comparison, Working paper, department of statistics, Ewha Womans University, Seoul.
- Korn, R. and Zeytun, S. (2013), ‘Efficient basket monte carlo option pricing via a simple analytical approximation’, *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* **243**(1), 48 – 59.

- Krekel, M., de Kock, J., Korn, R. and Man, T.-K. (2007), ‘An analysis of pricing methods for baskets options’, *Wilmott Magazine* **April 2007**, 82–89.
- Laurence, P. (2008), A new tool for correlation risk management: the market implied comonotonicity gap, Global Derivatives, Paris, Invited Talk, May 2008.
- Laurence, P. and Wang, T.-H. (2008), ‘Distribution-free upper bounds for spread options and market-implied antimonotonicity gap’, *The European Journal of Finance* **14**(8), 717 – 734.
- Linders, D. (2013), Pricing index options in a multivariate Black & Scholes model, Research report afi-1383 feb, Leuven: KU Leuven - Faculty of Business and Economics.
- Milevsky, M. and Posner, S. (1998), ‘A closed-form approximation for valuing basket options’, *The Journal of Derivatives* **5**(4), 54–61.
- Moosbrucker, T. (2006), ‘Explaining the correlation smile using Variance Gamma distributions’, *The Journal of Fixed Income* **16**(1), 71–87.
- Moskowitz, T. (2003), ‘An analysis of covariance risk and pricing anomalies’, *The Review of Financial studies* **16**(2), 417–457.
- Rubinstein, M. (1994), ‘Implied binomial trees’, *The Journal of Finance* **49**(3), 771–818.
- Schmid, F. and Schmidt, R. (2007), ‘Multivariate extensions of Spearman’s rho and related statistics’, *Statistics & Probability Letters* **77**(4), 407 – 416.
- Skintzi, V. D. and Refenes, A. N. (2005), ‘Implied correlation index: A new measure of diversification’, *Journal of Futures Markets* **25**, 171–197. doi: 10.1002/fut.20137.
- Skintzi, V. D., Skiadopoulos, G. and Refenes, A.-P. N. (2005), ‘The effect of misestimating correlation on value at risk.’, *Journal of Alternative Investments* **7**(4), 66 – 82.
- Tavin, B. (2013), Hedging dependence risk with spread options via the power frank and power student t copulas, Technical report, Université Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2192430>.
- Van Weert, K., Dhaene, J. and Goovaerts, M. (2010), ‘Optimal portfolio selection for general provisioning and terminal wealth problems’, *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **47**(1), 90 – 97.
- Van Weert, K., Dhaene, J. and Goovaerts, M. J. (2011), ‘Comonotonic approximations for a generalized provisioning problem with application to optimal portfolio selection’, *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* **235**, 3245–3256.
- Vanduffel, S., Hoedemakers, T. and Dhaene, J. (2005), ‘Comparing approximations for risk measures of sums of non-independent lognormal random variables’, *North American Actuarial Journal* **9**(4), 71–82.
- Whaley, R. (2000), ‘The investor fear gauge’, *Journal of Portfolio Management* **26**, 12–17.

Wong, A. S. (2012), ‘Quantitative impact of correlation errors on basket options with time-varying correlations’, *Journal of Futures Markets* **32**(2), 152–165.

FACULTY OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS

Naamsestraat 69 bus 3500

3000 LEUVEN, BELGIË

tel. + 32 16 32 66 12

fax + 32 16 32 67 91

info@econ.kuleuven.be

www.econ.kuleuven.be

